

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,155	06/25/2003	Michael E. Deflumere	20020043 US	5614
22500	7590 04/16/2004		EXAM	INER
	EMS INFORMATION	BUCZINSKI, STEPHEN C		
ELECTRONI 65 SPIT BRO	IC SYSTEMS INTEGRA OOK ROAD	ATION INC.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 868 NHQ1-719			3662	
NASHUA, NH 03061-0868			DATE MAILED: 04/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. 10	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/607,155	DEFLUMERE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stephen C. Buczinski	3662 M.C.				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vorce and the second period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_·					
24)	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage				
A44-2-b-10-2-4/2-)						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)				
Notice of Neterences Orice (170-002)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/607,155

Art Unit: 3662

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Housand et al or Messina '381.

Housand et al and Messina include correction of a laser boresight with respect to an IR passive boresight. In Housand et al R<sub>1</sub> corrects the laser per the discussion starting in col. 13, line 30 et seq. Further targeting and ranging are discussed in col. 1, lines 8-13. In Messina note col. 5, lines 39 et seq. and col. 2, line 44-47. Also, in Messina "designating/ranging" appears in 1:46. To the extent that the feedback resulting in correction of the alignment is not characterized as a "closed loop" system, it would have been obvious by the same effective operations of these claims.

As to claim 8 any scanning would inherently be minimized during target acquisition after alignment is achieved between the passive and active systems.

Application/Control Number: 10/607,155

Art Unit: 3662

4. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claim are replete with the misuse of "the" for --a-- resulting lack of antecedent basis. When a feature is being introduced for the first time, it is not preceded by the article adjective "the" which implies "said".

Claims 1-7 and 17-23 are objected as improper in that a single step of providing an apparatus plus function does not constitute a step in a method to the extent that a single step can even describe a method beyond a recitation of a desired result.

In claim 12, line 3, "instantiating" is not understood.

In claim 14, line 10, "said ladar" has no antecedent basis.

- 5. Messina '955 has been cited to also show related alignment.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen C. Buczinski whose telephone number is 703 305-1835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Tarcza can be reached on 703 306-4171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/607,155

Art Unit: 3662

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stephen C. Buczinski Primary Examiner Art Unit 3662

STEPHEN C. BUCZINSKI